

**Remarks**

This communication is responsive to the Office Action of March 20, 2009. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**Status of Claims**

Claims pending for examination: 23-37

Claims previously canceled: 1-22

Claims canceled herein: 28 and 31

Claims withdrawn herein: None

Claims in independent form: 23, 26 & 29

**Summary of The Office Action**

All previous rejections were withdrawn. New grounds of rejection were applied as follows:

Claims 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being purportedly anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0023237).

Claims 23-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being purportedly unpatentable over Drainville et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,724), in view of Yamada et al.

**Present Amendments**

Independent claim 23 has been amended. The amendments are supported by, for example, page 3, lines 6-7 of the specification. Thus no new matter has been added.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to include elements from claim 28. The amendments are also supported by, for example, page 6, lines 19-29 of the specification. Thus no new matter has been added.

Independent claim 29 has been amended to include elements from claim 31. The amendments are also supported by, for example, page 6, lines 19-29. Thus no new matter has been added.

**I. Claims 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being purportedly anticipated by Yamada et al.**

Independent Claims 23, 26 and 29 have been amended.

**Independent Claim 23**

Yamada fails to teach or suggest “generating and transmitting an event notification message to a device separate from the computer” as recited in claim 23. Claim 23 as a whole is not taught or suggested (MPEP 2141.02, section I). “When evaluating the scope of a claim, every limitation in the claim must be considered. USPTO personnel may not dissect a claimed invention into discrete elements and then evaluate the elements in isolation. Instead, the claim as a whole must be considered” (MPEP 2106, section II, C, last paragraph). The claimed feature in combination with the other elements as a whole is not taught by Yamada. Claim 23 is not anticipated and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claim 23 should now be in condition for allowance.

**Independent Claim 26**

Yamada fails to teach or suggest recognizing a wireless communication from a cellular telephone that is a request for calendar related data from within the computer. Yamada thus fails to teach or suggest wirelessly transmit the calendar related data to the cellular phone and fails to teach or suggest the claim as a whole.

Claim 26 is not anticipated and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claim 26 should now be in condition for allowance.

**Independent Claim 29**

Claim 29 includes the amended features from claim 23 and 26. Yamada fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 29, and fails to teach or

suggest the claim as a whole as required by MPEP 2106, section II, C, last paragraph. The rejection should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

**II. Claims 23-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being purportedly unpatentable over Drainville et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,724), in view of Yamada et al.**

The OA relies on Drainville for allegedly teaching “waking the computer.” (OA, page 4, section 4). Applicant provided a detailed explanation in the previous response that Drainville fails to teach or suggest such a feature or related features. The present OA does not provide any rebuttal arguments to explain why Applicant’s position is incorrect. Applicant repeats those arguments and respectfully requests that the examiner to clearly articulate a reasoning that rebuts applicant’s arguments. Otherwise, Drainville should be removed as a reference. Simply re-applying a reference that is shown as not relevant does not advance prosecution.


As explained above, Yamada fails to teach or suggest the claims. Thus the combination with Drainville still fails to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 26 and 29 have been amended to include elements related to the calendaring program from dependent claims 28 and 31, respectively. Dependent claim 25 also relates to a calendaring program. The rejection of claims 28 and 31 did not specifically address these features and did not identify where they are found in the references (OA, page 6). Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not taught or suggested by the references, individually or in combination. Thus independent claims 26 and 29, and dependent claim 25, should now be in condition for allowance along with their dependent claims.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, the claims are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Peter Kraguljac (Reg. No. 38,520)

(216) 503-5500  
(216) 503-5401 (fax)

Kraguljac & Kalnay, LLC  
Summit One, Suite 510  
4700 Rockside Road.  
Independence, OH 44131